UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,801	10/30/2003	Amarender Reddy KethiReddy	SLA1376	8126

7590   10/11/2006

Gerald W. Maliszewski
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA   92198-2829

EXAMINER
PYO, MONICA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 June 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 6/13/2006.

2.   Claims 1-13 are currently pending in this application and claim 1 is an independent

claim. In the Amendment filed 6/13/2006, claims 14-23 were canceled and no claims were

amended. This action is made Final.

Drawings

3.   The drawing was received on 6/13/2006. The drawing is accepted with changes and

therefore, the drawing objections made in a prior Office Action are withdrawn.

Specification

4.   The specification was received on 6/13/2006. The changes are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1-3 & 5-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,643,641 issued to Snyder et al. (hereafter Snyder) in view of U.S. Patent No.

6,199,042 issued to Kurzweil (hereafter Kurzweil).

Claim 1:

        Regarding Claim 1, Snyder disclose a method for locating searched terms in an image file

received from a search engine, the method comprising:

- **submitting a search term to a search engine having an indexed file database of image files,** as text strings found in the content of the web pages and indexed in the search engine database allows searchers to search (Snyder: col. 9, lns. 62- col. 10, lns. 7; col. 11, lns. 1-6; col. 12, lns. 54-64);

- **receiving an indexed file that cross-references image files to the search term,** as the crawler processes that fetch files from web pages subject to search (Snyder: col. 11, lns. 1-18; col. 12, lns. 2-24 & 54-58);

Snyder do not explicitly disclose:

- **performing an optical character recognition (OCR) operation on a selected image file;**

- **locating coordinates in the image file corresponding to the search term; and,**

- **automatically displaying the image file at the coordinates**

Kurzweil disclose:

- **performing an optical character recognition (OCR) operation on a selected image file,** as the image file is operated on by an "OCR" module (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17);

- **locating coordinates in the image file corresponding to the search term,** as the information in the data structure is used to generate highlighting of the words (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17; col. 4, lns. 15-19 & 28-43; fig. 3)**; and,**

- **automatically displaying the image file at the coordinates,** as those highlighted word appears on display item (Kurzweil: col. 4, lns. 15-19 & 28-43; fig. 3A).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to incorporate the Kurzweil's teaching of opening image file by optical character

recognition (OCR) module, and displaying image representation on the monitor into the Synder's

teaching of web searching engine with indexing method. Skilled artisan would have been

motivated to combine the OCR technique of Kurzweil in the web-searching engine of Synder to

enable the system to locate and display the text in the image files (Kurzweil: col. 1, lns. 6-24).

Claim 2:

Regarding Claim 2, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein automatically

displaying the image file at the coordinates includes displaying the search term located at the

image file coordinates (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17; col. 4, lns. 15-19 & 28-43; figs. 3A & 3B).

Claim 3:

Regarding Claim 3, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein displaying the

search term located at the image file coordinates includes highlighting the displayed search term

located at the image file coordinates (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17; col. 4, lns. 15-19 & 28-43; figs.

3A & 3B).

Claim 5:

Regarding Claim 5, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein submitting a

search term includes submitting a text search term (Snyder: col. 12, lns. 34-41 & 54-58).

Claim 6:

Regarding Claim 6, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein submitting a

search term includes submitting a search term selected from the group including keywords,

ASCII symbols, word patterns, and data patterns (Snyder: col. 11, lns. 40-50; col. 12, lns. 33-37

& 54-58; col. 13, lns. 32-43).

Claim 7:

> Regarding Claim 7, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method further comprising:
>
> - accepting a search term at a user interface (UI) (Snyder: col. 7, lns. 65-67; col. 13, lns. 32-39; figs. 1 & 3) & ; and,
>
> - wherein submitting a search term to a search engine includes submitting the search term, accepted at the UI, from a main application (Snyder: col. 7, lns. 23-30 & 65-67; fig. 1)

Claim 8:

> Regarding Claim 8, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method further comprising:
>
> - in response to receiving an indexed file cross-referencing image files to the search term, selecting an image file at the UI (Snyder: col. 12, lns. 8-24) & (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 40-67);
>
> - opening a viewer application (Snyder: col. 9, lns. 20-23) & (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 3-8);
>
> - in response to opening the viewer application, launching an OCR engine (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-18); and,
>
> - wherein performing an OCR operation on the image file includes performing an OCR operation on the selected image file in response to launching the OCR engine (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 19-25 & 40-52).

Claim 9:

Regarding Claim 9, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein locating

coordinates in the image file corresponding to the search term includes the OCR engine

supplying the coordinates to the viewer application (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 3-17).

Claim 10:

Regarding Claim 10, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein automatically

displaying the image file at the coordinates includes the viewer application highlighting the text

at the coordinates supplied by the OCR engine (Snyder: col. 12, lns. 8-28) & (Kurzweil: col. 4,

lns. 15-19 & 28-43; fig. 3A).

Claim 11:

Regarding Claim 11, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein receiving an

indexed file cross-referencing image files to the search term includes receiving a plurality of

image file references (Snyder: col. 12, lns. 8-24); and, wherein selecting an image file includes

selecting an image file from among the plurality of received image file references (Snyder: col.

12, lns. 25-33 & 57-64).

Claim 12:

Regarding Claim 12, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein opening a viewer

application includes opening a viewer application, selected from a plurality of viewer

applications, in response to the format of the selected image file (Snyder: col. 9, lns. 16-23; col.

12, lns. 57-64).

7.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurzweil in view

of Snyder, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0243626 by

Wyle et al. (hereafter Wyle).

Claim 4:

Regarding Claim 4, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein performing an

OCR operation on the image file includes performing an OCR operation on an image file in

(Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17)

Synder and Kurzweil do not explicitly disclose:

-               a format selected from the group including tagged image file format

(TIFF) and portable document (PDF) formats.

However, Wyle disclose:

-               a format selected from the group including tagged image file format

(TIFF) and portable document (PDF) formats (Wyle: pgs. 2-3, [0023]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to incorporate the document formats of Wyle into the Kurzweil's teaching of reading

system into the Synder's teaching of web searching engine with indexing method. Skilled

artisan would have been motivated to combine a various of document formatting of Wyle in the

OCR technique of Kurzweil and in the web-searching engine of Synder to utilize various of

document formats (Wyle: pgs. 2-3, [0023]).

8.   Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurzweil in view

of Snyder, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,889,256 by Palevich et al. (hereafter

Palevich).

Claim 13:

Regarding Claim 13, Snyder and Kurzweil disclose the method wherein locating

coordinates in the image file corresponding to the search term (Kurzweil: col. 3, lns. 9-17).

Snyder and Kurzweil do not explicitly disclose:

-       includes locating a sequence of bytes in the image file.

However, Palevich disclose:

-       includes locating a sequence of bytes in the image file (Palevich: col. 10, lns. 13-

        21).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to incorporate the Palevich's teaching of retrieving a sequence of bytes from the image

file into the Kurzweil's teaching of reading system and, into the Synder's teaching of web

searching engine with indexing method. Skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine

the use of bytes sequencing in the OCR technique of Kurzweil and in the web-searching engine

of Synder to utilize byte range or the like in order to retrieve the data (Palevich: col. 2, lns. 9-15).

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed 6/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        The main point of applicant's argument is that the Office Action does not provide any

rationale for combining references. However, the Examiner disagrees with this argument. As

stated above in the rejections, the Examiner provides a motivation for combining the references. It should be noted that the test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art and there is no requirement that prior art provide the same reason as the applicant to make the claimed invention.

Applicant also argues that Snyder and Kurzweil do not explicitly disclose every limitation of claim 1. However, the Examiner disagrees. Snyder and Kurzweil combined disclose the features of indexing text strings found in the content of the web pages and allowing searchers to search in the search engine data and the OCR module operating the image files the highlighted word appears on display item as stated above in the rejections. Therefore, Snyder and Kurzweil read on the broadly claimed limitation of Claim 1.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica M. Pyo whose telephone number is 571-272-8192. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 6:30 - 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Monica M Pyo
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

mp
9/18/2006

Leslie Wong
Primary Examiner